



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,173	11/30/2001	Khiem Le	NC17216 (NOKI13-17216)	9510
43829	7590	04/04/2006	EXAMINER	
ROBERT M BAUER, ESQ. LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP 1 CHASE ROAD SCARSDALE, NY 10583			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/000,173	LE ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher J. Brown	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 12/20/05, with respect to objections, and USC 112 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive.

The objection to the informal drawings has been withdrawn upon inspection of new drawings.

The objections to claims 4 and 5 have been withdrawn upon inspection of amendments.

The USC 112 rejections of claims 1, and 15 have been withdrawn upon inspection of amendments.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues against USC 103 rejection of claims 1, and 15 rejected by Malkin US 6,061,650 in view of Ahonen US 2001/0009025.

Applicant argues that Malkin does not teach a proxy that facilitating authentication of the mobile station. The examiner argues that Malkin does teach the features stated in claims 1 and 15. Malkin teaches a remote access server in a service provider network, that provides a remote node to be authenticated, and facilitates the authentication. This proxy server is the link between the remote node and the home network, (Col 2 lines 25-47).

Malkin states that the remote node submits information, to the remote access server which in turn adds extra information and forwards the request to an authentication server in order to open communication between a remote node and home network, thus the node is authenticated, and the remote access server has facilitated said authentication. Malkin also states that the system he teaches could be a wireless system, (Col 6 line 57).

The applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Malik and Ahonen. The applicant argues that the references are not of an analogous art. The examiner argues that the references are of an analogous art, namely, both references relate to networks, and network security. While Malik does not teach a wireless station, the reference does teach that the system taught could be wireless. Ahonen teaches a similar network configuration to Malik and authentication, but via a wireless system with a mobile station. It is well known that there are benefits to using a wireless device over a fixed device and thus motivation to use a wireless system.

The previous rejection is included below for the applicant's convenience:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkin US 6,061,650, in view of Ahonen US 2001/0009025.

As per claims 1 and 15, Malkin teaches a first access network portion coupled to a core network, (Fig 1, Col 2 lines 18-25). Malkin teaches the system provides mobile functionality and wireless support, (Col 1 lines 64-66, Col 6 line 57). Malkin teaches an authentication request, and an identifier identifying indicia used to facilitate delivery of the authentication request to an authenticator, (Col 2 lines 30-48, Col 3 line 66- Col 4 line 18).

Malkin doesn't explicitly teach a mobile station.

Ahonen teaches a mobile station that receives authentication via an access network, a core network, and an authenticator, [0109], [0110], Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the mobile station of Ahonen with the authentication system of Malkin because the mobile station is portable and more convenient than a stationary PSTN terminal.

As per claims 2, 9, 10, and 16, Malkin teaches indicia is an authenticator address, (Col 2 lines 33-45, Col 4 line 17).

As per claims 3, 11, 17 and 20, Malkin teaches indicia is an authentication method, (Col 2 lines 55-57, Col 4 line 18)

As per claims 6 and 18, Makin teaches the identifier is formed of a proxy in the first access network, (Fig 1).

As per claims 7 and 19, Malkin teaches the proxy comprises an authentication request, a message forwarder, and that the request include indicia associated with the authenticator, (Col 2 lines 30-48, Col 3 line 66- Col 4 line 18).

As per claim 8, Malkin teaches a message including a username and password, which are text based, (Col 4 line 15).

As per claim 12, Ahonen teaches that the message is positioned at the mobile station, [0109], [0110], [0111].

As per claim 13, Ahonen teaches that the origin of the communication is identified, [0113].

As per claim 14 Ahonen teaches a registration procedure by the mobile station, [0035].

Claims 1-3, 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkin US 6,061,650, in view of Ahonen US 2001/0009025 in view of Melaku US 2003/0032414.

As per claim 4 the previous Malkin-Ahonen combination does not teach at least a first access network coupled to a core network associated with a first authenticator and at least a second access network coupled to the core network associated with a second authenticator.

Malaku teaches a mobile telecommunications network with at least a first access network coupled to a core network associated with a first authenticator and at least a second access network coupled to the core network associated with a second authenticator, Fig 1, [0022].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the networks and authenticators of Malaku in the system of Malkin-Ahonen to reduce network traffic from mobile phone authentication in separate geographic regions.

As per claim 5 the Malkin-Ahonen-Malaku system teaches that indicia indicates which authenticator to use based on the access network, (Malkin Col 2 lines 33-45, Col 4 line 17).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2134

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jaques Louis Jaques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

3/31/06

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jaques Louis Jaques". The signature is written in a cursive style with some variations in letter height and slant. It appears to be a personal signature rather than a formal one.